

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4 – 10, 12 – 20 and 22 – 28 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 10 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirose et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,537,307) in view of Cocconi (U.S. Pat. No. ,341,075). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that the Examiner had stated that claims 2 – 9, 11 – 19 and 21 – 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form in the Office Action issued on August 11, 2005. In the response filed on October 4, 2005, Applicants amended each of claims 1, 10 and 20 to incorporate the allowable subject-matter of claims 3, 11 and 21, respectively, which were concurrently cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 10 and 20, as filed on October 4, 2005, define over the prior art as admitted to by the Examiner in the August 11, 2005 Office Action.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner maintains the rejections of claims 1, 10 and 20, without recognizing that claims 1, 10 and 20, as amended on October 4, 2005, include the allowable subject-matter of claims 3, 11 and 21.

Claims 1, 10 and 20 each include controlling an inverter based on a voltage control signal that is generated based on a first adjusted phase current, which is based on a first phase current, a second adjusted phase current, which is based on a second phase current, and an available current, which is based on said first and second

adjusted phase currents. Neither prior art reference teaches or suggests controlling an inverter based on a voltage control signal that is generated based on a first adjusted phase current, which is based on a first phase current, a second adjusted phase current, which is based on a second phase current, and an available current, which is based on said first and second adjusted phase currents, as admitted to by the Examiner in the August 11, 2005 Office Action when the Examiner asserted the allowable subject-matter of claims 3, 11 and 21.

Accordingly, claims 1, 10 and 20 each define over the prior art. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 2 – 9, 11 – 19 and 21 - 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As discussed in detail above, claims 1, 10 and 20 were already amended in the response filed on October 4, 2005 to include the allowable subject-matter of claims 3, 11 and 21, respectively. Therefore, claims 1, 10 and 20 define over the prior art and claims 2, 4 – 9, 12 – 19 and 22 – 28, each of which depend on one of claims 1, 10 and 20, also define over the prior art for at least the same reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (313) 665-4969.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/6/06

By: Michael D. Wiggins  
Michael D. Wiggins  
Reg. No. 34,754

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION  
Legal Staff, Mail Code 482-C23-B21  
P.O. Box 300  
Detroit, MI 48265-3000